

Sample Resolution to Support Expansion of Emergency Planning Zones around Nuclear Power Reactors

Whereas the March 2011 nuclear accident at Fukushima resulted in a mandatory evacuation of a 12 mile radius around the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear site, a recommended evacuation of an 18-mile radius, and actual evacuation of villages 25 miles away to the northwest of Fukushima Daiichi;

Whereas the April 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident resulted in creation of a permanent 18-mile exclusion zone around the Chernobyl nuclear site and actual evacuation of villages 100 miles and more away;

Whereas the March 2011 nuclear accident at Fukushima resulted in numerous documented instances of interdiction of contaminated food and livestock 100 miles and more from the Fukushima Daiichi site and widespread contamination of crops and other vegetation;

Whereas the April 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident resulted in interdiction of contaminated food and livestock hundreds of miles from the Chernobyl site (including continued interdiction of contaminated livestock in Wales—approximately 1,000 miles away) and widespread contamination of crops and other vegetation;

Whereas current U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations establish a 10-mile Emergency Planning Zone for evacuations around U.S. nuclear reactors and a 50-mile Ingestion Pathway Zone to monitor and potentially interdict contaminated food, water, milk and livestock;

Whereas, based on the real-world experience of the Fukushima and Chernobyl nuclear accidents, the 10 mile Emergency Planning Zone and 50 mile Ingestion Pathway zones are inadequate and outdated;

Whereas the Fukushima nuclear accident was caused by an earthquake and ensuing tsunami, which knocked out critical offsite and onsite power sources, demonstrating that natural disasters can initiate severe nuclear accidents;

Whereas the August 2011 mid-Atlantic earthquake resulted in a ground speed motion double that which the nearby North Anna nuclear complex was designed to withstand, and knocked out offsite power to the site;

Whereas tornadoes, hurricanes and floods during 2011 caused loss of offsite power and other damage to several nuclear reactor sites across the U.S., including Browns Ferry in Alabama, Surry in Virginia, Calvert Cliffs in Maryland and Fort Calhoun in Nebraska, demonstrating that natural disasters can challenge nuclear safety systems;

Whereas current Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations do not require bi-annual emergency exercises to include scenarios of regionally-appropriate initiating or concurrent natural disasters;

Whereas the citizens of [Jurisdiction] deserve the greatest possible protection from nuclear power accidents and the greatest possible preparation to mitigate the effects of nuclear accidents;

Whereas current Nuclear Regulatory Commission emergency planning regulations are inadequate to provide a sufficient level of protection for the citizens of [Jurisdiction];

BE IT RESOLVED THAT [JURISDICTION]

Supports the expansion of current Emergency Planning zones from 10 to 25 miles around U.S. nuclear reactor sites;

Supports the creation of a new Emergency Response Zone of 25 to 50 miles around U.S. nuclear reactor sites that would require nuclear power utilities to identify evacuation routes and provide this information to the public within this zone;

Supports the expansion of the Ingestion Pathway Zone from 50 miles to 100 miles around U.S. nuclear reactor sites;

Supports emergency evacuation exercises that practice response to situations involving regionally-appropriate initiating or concurrent natural disasters;

Supports the Petition for Rulemaking submitted by 38 organizations across the United States on February 15, 2012, since endorsed by more than 2700 organizations and individuals, and docketed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as PRM-50-104, which would make the necessary changes to emergency regulations detailed above;

Be it further resolved that [Jurisdiction] will send a copy of this approved resolution to our state and federal elected officials and calls on them to also support PRM-50-104. In addition, [Jurisdiction] will inform the Secretary of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the appointed Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners of its support for PRM-50-104.